



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/717,481	11/21/2000	Roland Thomas Palmatier	600.1075	9584

7590 04/08/2003

Davidson Davidson & Kappel LLC
14th Floor
485 Seventh Avenue
New York, NY 10018

EXAMINER

CRENSHAW, MARVIN P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2854

DATE MAILED: 04/08/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application N .

09/717,481

Applicant(s)

PALMATIER, ROLAND THOMAS

Examiner

Marvin P. Crenshaw

Art Unit

2854

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 January 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 and 30-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 12-26 and 30 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 and 31-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 March 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____. 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5 and 31 – 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richards et al. in view of Petersen et al.

Richards et al. teaches a printing device (Fig. 1) comprising a roll-to-roll (Fig. 1) printing press for forming a plurality of printed rolls (7). However, Richards et al. doesn't teach a separate assembly device having a roll unwinding device. Petersen et al. teaches an assembly device (Fig. 1) the assembly device having a plurality (15-18) of roll unwinding devices separate from the printing press, a first folder (31) accepting at least one first web from the roll unwinding devices and forming first signatures and a second folder (31) accepting at least one second web from the roll unwinding devices and forming second signatures, the printing device including a roll storage unit (19) disposed between the printing press and the assembly device, the printing device wherein the assembly device includes more than four roll (15-16) unwinding devices. It would be obvious to modify the printing device of Richards et al. to have a separate assembly device as taught by Petersen et al. to form signatures with multiple roll unwinding devices.

Richards et al. also teaches a printing device wherein the printing press includes a slitter (80) for slitting the web into a plurality of ribbons, the ribbons being wound to form the plurality of printed rolls (Fig. 2).

With respect to claim 1, having a second folder, it would be obvious to have a second folding unit to form second signatures from the unwinding rolls since it is clear that two folding units would expedite processing of the two rolls.

With respect to claim 5, the printing assembly device including more than four roll unwinding devices is a design choice for having a duplication of parts to have more than one roll unwinding devices to form signatures.

With respect to claim 33, Richards et al. does not teach the printing device having the first folder exits the first signatures in a first direction and the second folder exits the second signatures in a second direction parallel to the first direction and the conveying device has a conveying direction perpendicular to the first and second direction. However, Peterson et al. teaches printing device having the first folder exits the first signatures in a first direction and the second folder exits the second signatures in a second direction parallel to the first direction and the conveying device has a conveying direction perpendicular to the first and second direction. It would have been obvious to modify the printing device of Richards et al. to have the printing device as taught by Peterson et al. to provide the two folding units with a conveyor for each unit would expedite the processing of the two rolls after forming the signatures for stacking.

Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petersen et al. in view of Hermach.

Petersen et al. teaches an assembly device (Fig. 1) for assembling printed rolls of material comprising a plurality (15-18) of roll unwinding devices a first folder (31) accepting at least one first web from the roll unwinding devices and forming first signatures. However, Petersen et al. doesn't teach a second folder accepting at least one second web from the roll unwinding devices and forming second signatures. Hermach teaches a second folder (26B) accepting at least one second web from the roll unwinding devices and forming second signatures. It would be obvious to modify the assembly device of Petersen et al. to have a second folder accepting at least one second web from the roll unwinding device and forming signatures as taught by Hermach because one of ordinary skill would recognize that a second folder would expedite the formation of signatures. Peterson also teaches the assembly device wherein the first folder (See col. 3, line 10-14) includes a former board. The assembly device wherein the first folder includes a cutter (See col. 3, lines 9-14).

Claims 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petersen et al in view of Welborn.

Petersen et al. teaches all that is claimed in the above rejection, claims 6-8, except the assembly device wherein the first folder is a plow folder and the assembly device further comprising a conveyor for collecting the first and second signatures. Welborn teaches an assembly device wherein the first folder is a plow folder (see col. 11, lines 8-11) and the assembly device further comprising a

conveyor (18) for collecting the first and second signatures. It would be obvious to modify the assembly device of Peterson et al. to have the assembly device having the first folder is a plow folder and the assembly device further comprising a conveyor for collecting the first and second signatures as taught by Welborn for folding and stacking the finished product in an efficient manner, as taught by Welborn.

With respect to claim 11, the assembly device having a plurality of unwinding device include at least five roll unwinding devices is a design choice for having a duplication of parts to have more than one roll unwinding devices to form signatures.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-11 and 31-33 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Specifically, Richards et al. teaches a printing unit for forming printed plurality of printed rolls, and Peterson et al. teaches a separate device for unwinding rolls and forming signatures. One having ordinary skill in the art would find it obvious to combine these teachings to expedite processing.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is

filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marvin P. Crenshaw whose telephone number is (703) 308-0797. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Hirshfeld can be reached on (703) 305-6619. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722 for regular communications and (703) 308-7724 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.



MPC
April 7, 2003



ANDREW H. HIRSHFELD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800